

Key Findings Summary

All the labels are understandable, but Label 2 appears to perform the best

Correct answers to the six questions ranged from 46% to 78%, with all but two of the questions having half or more of the respondents correctly choosing the “better” vehicle. At first glance these results might seem disappointing for labels that are designed to assist consumers to choose the most fuel efficient vehicles. However, they are actually very promising considering that the survey questions required respondents to make use of *new* metrics (such as MPGe, vehicle range, gallons per 100 miles, and CO² grams), for *new* vehicle technologies (such as EREVs and PHEVs), on completely *new* label designs.

Overall, the differences in understandability of the three label designs, although statistically significant, are relatively small. Nonetheless, Label 2 appears to be the most understandable design. Label 1 appears to be the least understandable, as evidenced by responses to four of the six questions. One possible explanation for this is that fuel economy and range metrics tended to be used most by respondents who saw Labels 2 and 3 when choosing the “better” vehicle. Those metrics are more prominent on those label designs compared to Label 1.

The regression analysis results further support this conclusion given that ...

Commented [BWB1]: Randy to insert his summary here.

Labels 1 and 3 appear to be more influential, especially for ‘less complex’ vehicle technologies

Respondents appear to have focused mostly on fuel economy, range, and fuel cost metrics when choosing which vehicle they would purchase. Overall, the differences in influence of the three label designs, although statistically significant in three of the four questions, are relatively small. Nonetheless, Labels 1 and 3 appear to be more influential when respondents chose ‘less complex’ technologies (such as gasoline or electric vehicles). When the choices involved more complex vehicles (such as EREVs or PHEVs), those respondents who saw label 2 were somewhat more likely to choose the more complex vehicle. This might be explained by the fact that having to consider dual-fuels or blended-fuels was easier to do with the Label 2 design. This finding is in accordance with the previous discussion regarding label understanding, in which Label 2 appeared to be more understandable than the other label designs.

The regression analysis results further support this conclusion given that ...

Commented [BWB2]: Randy to insert his summary here.